

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-18 are pending and under consideration.

INTERVIEW

First, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview granted to Applicant's representative on November 28, 2006, at which time the outstanding issues in this case were discussed. Arguments similar to the ones developed hereinafter were presented and the Examiner indicated that in light of the arguments, the amended claims appear to be allowable and he would reconsider the outstanding grounds for rejection upon formal submission of a response. The Primary Examiner, Charles Rones, who supervises the Examiner, was also present at the Interview.

The Primary Examiner indicated that the phrase "capable of" makes the independent claims potentially subject to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 2. In view of the Primary Examiner's suggestions for enhancing the form of the independent claims, claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 16 and 17 are amended herewith.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,263,335 to Paik et al. (hereinafter "Paik").

Paik is directed to a dynamic information extraction system that allows users to ask questions about documents in a database, and responds to queries by returning possibly relevant information extracted from the documents.

Paik was previously cited in the Office Action mailed on December 16, 2005. The arguments put forth in the response filed on March 16, 2006, were considered valid and Paik was not cited again in the Office Action mailed on May 15, 2006.

Paik does not teach or suggest extracting a commodity value based on a chronological value related to

- (1) date-and-time data pertaining to theme information of the community site, and
- (2) date-and-time information provided by a timer.

In the outstanding Office Action, it is alleged col. 5, lines 3-21, of Paik anticipates

"extracting commodity information from a database according to a chronological value representing date and time as related to date-and-time data pertaining to theme information of the community site and date-and-time information provided by a timer" as recited in claim 18. Applicant disagrees with this assertion. The indicated portion of Paik recites:

In this specific embodiment, the system extracts from news articles and news feeds information about all named entities and their relations to any named entity or concept: events, organizations, people, or other concepts. The information is merged into a single profile, with reference to original sources, and it is organized chronologically to create an instant biography. This information can be retrieved by the user either in response to W-H questions, or it can be used by browsing through a hyperlinked, dynamic graphical summary of all the information on any named entity in the database.

In claim 18 the chronological value is related to (1) date-and-time data pertaining to theme information of the community site, and (2) date-and-time information provided by a timer. This recitation shows that extracting commodity information according to the method recited in claim 18 is characterized by the chronological value, which is determined based on date-and-time information within the source and an actual date-and-time provided by a timer. In Paik, the retrieved information is organized in chronological order based on date-and-time information within the source. However, the date-and-time (2) provided by the timer has no role in Paik. Therefore, Paik's chronological manner of organizing the information retrieved from a database does not read over the method recited in claim 18. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration of claim 18.

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that she understood this argument and agreed that Paik does not perform a database search based on two date-and-time pieces of information.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0050976 to Block et al. ("Block") in view of Paik.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a community site constructing method for constructing a community site on a network, by utilizing a network including a central apparatus, which manages a community site, includes a timer and a terminal device used by a representative of the community site or a member previously authorized by the representative to have access to the community site. The

method comprises:

- registering personal information about the representative and theme information of the community site in a basic information database in association with identification information for identifying the representative of the community site;
- registering member information about a member in a member information database in association with identification information for identifying the member of the community site;
- registering commodity information about commodities to be provided in a commodity database in association with the theme information;
- extracting the commodity information from the commodity database based on the theme information registered in the basic information database and a chronological value; and
- transmitting the extracted commodity information from the central apparatus to the terminal device.

Further claim 1 specifies that

- the theme information includes information about the representative, a person related to the representative, a main theme including an event relating to the representative, and date-and-time relating to the main theme;
- the commodity database has the commodity information about commodities to be provided, registered therein in association with the date-and-time information; and
- the chronological value is based on the date-and-time information of the theme information and date-and-time information output from the timer unit.

As argued above Paik does not teach or suggest at least extracting the commodity information from the commodity database according to a chronological value which is based on the date-and-time information of the theme information and date-and-time information output from the timer unit. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Paik does not anticipate claim 1.

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that she understood this argument and agreed that Paik does not perform a database search based on two date-and-time pieces of information.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-7

Independent claim 2 recites a community site constructing system for constructing a community site on a network which includes a central apparatus for managing a community site, a terminal device used by a representative of the community site or a member previously authorized by the representative to have access to the community site, a basic information database, a member information database, and a commodity database. The central apparatus includes a timer unit and a processor capable to extract the commodity information from the commodity database according to a chronological value, based on the date-and-time information of the theme information and the date-and-time information output from the timer unit.

The basic information database stores personal information about the representative and theme information of the community site in association with identification information for identifying the representative of the community site. The member information database stores member information about a member in association with identification information for identifying the member of the community site. The commodity database stores commodity information about commodities to be provided in association with the theme information, the commodity database has the commodity information about commodities to be provided registered therein in association with the date-and-time information.

According to claim 2, the central apparatus includes a processor capable to extract the commodity information from the commodity database based on the theme information registered in the basic information database, and to transmit the extracted commodity information to the terminal device.

Claim 2 further specifies that the theme information includes information about the representative, a person related to the representative, a main theme including an event relating to the representative, and date-and- time relating to a main theme.

In the Office Action, it is submitted that Block does not teach the central apparatus including a timer unit and a processor as recited in claim 2, but Paik is relied upon to cure this deficiency of Block (see the Office Action mailed on October 5, 2006, page 5). However as argued above Paik (col. 5, lines 14-21) does not teach or suggest anything like “extracting the commodity information from the commodity database according to [...] a chronological value [...] based on the date-and-time information of the theme information and date-and-time information output from the timer unit.” In Paik information is arranged in chronological order, and even if *arguendo* a time stamp is inherently generated by a clock, Paik is silent about any use of time stamp information (as date-and-time information output from the timer unit) and the date-and-

time information of the theme information to determine the chronological value used to extract the commodity information from the commodity database. Therefore claim 2 and claims 3 and 5-8 depending upon claim 2, patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

Claim 9

Independent claim 9 is patentable at least because the central apparatus timer is not disclosed by Paik and neither is the processor “extracting the commodity information from the commodity database according to [...] a chronological value [...] based on the date-and-time information of the theme information and the date-and-time information output from the timer unit.”

Claim 10

Independent claim 10 is directed to a computer memory product in which a computer program is recorded, the computer program causing a computer to manage a community site in which a representative and a member previously authorized by the representative to have access to the community site participate. Claim 10 patentable distinguishes over Paik and Block alone or in combination at least by reciting that “[extracting] the commodity information from the commodity database according to a chronological value, based on date-and-time information of the theme information and date-and-time information output from a timer unit.”

Claims 11, 12, and 14

Independent claim 11 is directed to a community site constructing system for constructing a community site on a network including a central apparatus, a terminal device, a basic information database, a member information database and a commodity database. The cited prior art does not teach or suggest at least the central apparatus including a timer unit and the central apparatus “extracting the commodity information from the commodity database according to [...] a chronological value [...] based on the date-and-time information of the theme information and date-and-time information output from the timer unit.” Therefore claim 11 and claims 12, and 14 depending upon claim 11 are patentable over Paik and Block.

Claim 16

Independent claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least because the central apparatus including a timer unit and “[extracting] the commodity information from the commodity database according to [...] a chronological value [...] based on the date-and-time information of the theme information and the date-and-time information output from the timer unit” is not rendered obvious by the cited prior art.

Claim 17

The method of independent claim 17 is patentable over the cited prior art at least by reciting “[retrieving] the commodity information from the commodity database according to [...] a chronological value based on date-and-time information of the theme information and date-and-time information output from a timer unit.”

Claims 8 and 15

On page 16 of the outstanding Office Action dependent claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block in view of Paik and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0095442 to Hunter et al. (“Hunter”).

Hunter does not correct or compensate the above-identified deficiency of Paik and Block in teaching all the features of the independent claims. Therefore, dependent claims 8 and 15 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claims 2 and 11 from which they respectively depend.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Dec. 15, 2006

By: L.Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501